

Grant Road Improvement Corridor Planning Task Force

March 18, 2015

Tucson Association of Realtors

2445 N. Tucson Boulevard

Tucson, AZ 85716

Meeting Results

1) Call to order – Project Team & Task Force Introductions

The meeting was called to order by the facilitator, Nanci Beizer. A quorum was established and informational handouts were distributed to the Task Force. Alice Roe could not attend the meeting and instructed that the facilitator read a statement on her behalf. Her statement emphasized the importance of implementing the land use tools.

Citizen Task Force Members

Present		Absent
Dale Calvert	Andrew Jones	Alice Roe
Beverly Rutter	David Sunderman	Henry Jacobson
Jay Young	Jim Hogan	Wayne Cullop
Moon Joe Yee	Linda Marie Small	John Wakefield
Robert Tait	Roy Garcia	Rebecca Ramey
Shannon McBride-Olsen	Susan Alexander	

2) Review and approve February 24, 2015, Meeting Summary

The Task Force reviewed and approved the February 24, 2015, meeting summary with a minor revision. The project team will post the approved summary to the Clerk's office.

3) Special Guest & Colleague

Nicole Ewing-Gavin, Office of Integrated Planning (OIP), explained how the land use project will be instituted in the future. OIP will be taking an integrated approach to land use by coordinating Real Estate, Planning and Development Services, and the Economic Initiatives departments. Thus far, OIP has extensively reviewed the *Draft Community Character and Vitality Report*, *Draft Grant Road District Zoning Ordinance*, and the six neighborhood plans associated with the Grant

Road Improvement Project. Grant Road will act as the pioneer project in establishing a model approach that can be applied to other RTA corridor projects.

Rebecca Roupp, OIP, presented the three elements and recommendations for the Task Force to consider:

- 1) Request Mayor & Council adopt corridor vision depicted in *Draft Community Character and Vitality Report*, with minor modifications.
- 2) Achieve vision through development and implementation of land use planning tools, including an overlay and other tools in phases timed with roadway design.
- 3) Have Task Force continue to review roadway design, and form a Land Use Subcommittee of the Task Force to advise on overlay and other land use planning tool development and implementation.

Phil Erickson, Community Design & Architecture, provided the Task Force and the public with a description of the original approach to land use. When the Grant Road Improvement Project was originally instated, it involved public input regarding roadway design, the future environment of Grant Road and land use. Derived from public input, the project team focused on locations within the 5-mile corridor that had potential for mixed use. Centers and districts were identified and aligned with the overall vision of Grant Road. When the project team began to implement the land use tools, there was significant complexity regarding amending and updating neighborhood plans, which inhibited the progress of the land use process. Now, with the formation of OIP, the land use process is being reestablished and reevaluated.

4) Land Use Planning Approach

Rebecca Roupp, OIP, provided insight regarding the land use process and recommended that the Task Force adopt Recommendation #1, which states ***Request that Mayor & Council adopt the Grant Road Corridor Vision based on Draft Community Character and Vitality Report, with modifications to streamline and update process, address dated information, enhance maps for readability, and remove some detail to create a policy-level document.*** She explained that the corridor vision was never formalized through adoption, offers a cohesive image for the corridor, establishes a framework and principles to guide development and implementation of the overlay and other land use planning tools, provides policy-level guidance to avoid conflict with area and neighborhood plans. Additionally, Rebecca reviewed the specific modifications that could be made to the document.

Nicole Ewing-Gavin, OIP, explained Recommendation #2, which states ***proceed with a phased approach to developing and implementing land use planning tools. Land Use Planning Phases would be based on roadway design phases and tools would include overlay, possibly regulatory changes, property disposition strategies, and economic investment.*** OIP is now

recommending that the best approach to instituting the overlay is adopting the corridor vision and rolling out the overlay in phases. The rationale behind this recommendation is that achieving a corridor vision will require multiple tools and strategies, undertaking development and implementation of land use planning tools for a full 5-mile corridor is not manageable due to complexity, evaluating small segments allows for continuous refinements, and aligning land use tools with roadway design allows for a great certainty regarding remnant parcels and redevelopment sites.

5) Task Force Role & Schedule

Rebecca Roupp, OIP, discussed Recommendation #3 indicating that the ***Task Force stays in place as constituted to weigh in on roadway design at appropriate times for each of the remaining phases. Assumption is that the full Task Force would meet 2-4 times per year for the next 2 years. A Land Use Planning Subcommittee of the Task Force would be formed to advise on overlay and other land use planning tools. Meeting frequency would range from monthly to quarterly for the next 2 years and would include members attending neighborhood meetings and Planning Commission.*** This recommendation provides continuity in the process from design initiation through design completion and ongoing task force input regarding roadway design for each project phase. Additionally, it offers a forum for public comment as the roadway design moves forward. The land use subcommittee provides an option for the Task Force members particularly interested in land use planning to meet more frequently and work in conjunction with the Planning Commission to implement the land use tools.

Task Force Discussion – Recommendation #1

- The way that I understand it, property owners need to opt in for overlay uses vs. using existing zoning. This is related to eminent domain issues and may cause City to spend money to take properties. Is that correct?
 - Generally an overlay is a City initiated rezoning. It is done as an optional zoning. It is not necessarily related to the acquisition process.
- As a property owner who wants to redevelop, it's my choice to use existing zoning or opt into the overlay. At what point do I have to make that decision and is it binding?
 - You can make that decision at any time or pursue your own rezoning.
- I am comfortable with the concept of getting the Draft report catalogued and adopted as a unifying concept. The Task Force will have comments once there is a draft available. Many on the Task Force wanted to institute an overlay all done at one time, but it is obvious that can't happen. Getting it done up front is important.
- I am comfortable with Recommendation #1; however, who is doing the modifications?

- OIP will make the modifications and email the revised Draft to the Task Force for feedback. OIP has reviewed the document and has a list of suggested changes.
- Recall previous discussions when we presented the overlay; neighborhoods objected so the project team allowed neighborhoods to opt-in and the overlay was stalled. The overlay is important for land use. Until the City acquires specific properties along the roadway and we know remnant locations, then we should be able to say “with this land use zoning we can make it a suitable area for developers, considering what neighbors are thinking and continuity of the roadway.” Having an overlay zone in addition to existing zoning is a great asset to maximize usage. The overlay zone is provided by the City as an adaptation to what you already have.
 - The overlay is part of Recommendation #2. We would like to provide tools for property owners and break it into smaller segments to allow us to take a closer look.
- If we go with Recommendation #1, what is the public outreach plan? We got close and were torpedoed by the public last time; the public and elected officials – had a good concept last time, our project got mixed in with 4th Avenue and the University. What is the strategy this time?
 - We will start by reviewing our materials with the Task Force. After it is reviewed, we will post the documents online and institute a 3-week comment period. Additionally we would reach out to neighborhoods and explain the content. We would like to garner the support from the public and Mayor and Council. If there are amendments to the process we are open for suggestions.
 - The elements that require zoning changes were controversial. There wasn’t a unifying vision that was adopted. We have seen in Phase 1 and Phase 2 that elements can change in the roadway design. If the implementation tools are applied to align with the phases, you can maximize your opportunity.
- I thought that corridor vision and overlay zone were the same thing until Phil articulated the difference. I love the idea of endorsing the plan to unify the corridor and break out tools for development with the overlay being one of them for property owners to use in redevelopment. The only thing I remember being contentious when we were discussing the vision is building height. The property owner already has the zoning to have higher building height. We need to clearly communicate this to neighborhoods.
 - This is why we would like to present this on a smaller scale.
- When did the Vision document get completed?
 - December 13, 2011
- The vision was strongly supported and at the heart of moving forward with the overlay. We thought the overlay was a good idea to accomplishing the vision. I’m happy about

this. The vision ultimately came from the community – linking it (to land use planning) is a good idea. I also like the process that the recommendations will come back to the Task Force and that there is an efficient time frame.

- The height was the big objection in the community meeting. As much as I liked the document (Community Character & Vitality Report), it did not convey that you could go up in height. My biggest concern is stalling the process? In my neighborhood association, 18 people made decisions for 3,000 people in the neighborhood. I am worried about the small minority in neighborhood input.

Consensus Vote for Recommendation #1

11 – Unqualified Yes

1 – Perfectly acceptable

Task Force Discussion – Recommendation #2

- What are some of the economic incentives that owners can receive? Can you provide some examples from Main Gate?
 - One of the incentives for Main Gate is that there were a group of land uses that were able to be used regardless of the zoning. There was flexibility in development standards – you didn't have to provide the typical landscaping, setbacks, reduced parking requirements. With historic properties, the fees were reduced by a half and added uses such as commercial. The developers are required to do a higher level of design in return for incentives. We will explore options that fit this roadway.
- I am very comfortable with Recommendation #2 – breaking this down in segments. I think it is logical to link the overlay with construction.
- For the three phases you are working on, are the phases bounded? Are the segments always consecutive or can it be more fluid? If planning is successful in one phase and it could be applied sooner, it might not take so long.
 - As we are working on the phases, if we notice economic incentives or regulatory relief that could be applied corridor wide, we would consider. We could make a change regarding boundaries and neighborhoods. We showed overlap in the phasing if there are things that can be applied corridor wide or made fluid.
 - At 30% design in the phases we will have more information regarding remnant parcels.
- If you are using the overlay zone, will it encompass a block? Apply equally to both sides of the street – for example, height restrictions? If you have to amend, what is the process?

- We are looking at coinciding the overlay zone with the construction phases.
- We might have to look at the north and south sides of Grant Road differently. We would like to have an overall vision and baseline. Amending the process would be similar to the approval process. The amendments would need to be adopted by Mayor & Council.
- What happens if a school closes? For example, what if Doolen School is no longer needed? That's multiple acres. That could make a big difference to the overlay and the process.
- In looking at this approach, it is as close to getting us back to where we were.

Consensus Vote for Recommendation #2

12 – Unqualified Yes

Task Force Discussion – Recommendation #3

- How do you propose the make-up of the Land Use Planning Subcommittee? One representative from each group – neighborhoods, businesses, regional users?
 - We are going to start with asking for volunteers and see if we are balanced.
- What's the size of the subcommittee?
 - It depends on how many people are interested. We are thinking 3-7 people. We would like to find a process that can start achieving some of the land use goals.
- I need more detail on the subcommittee to be able to make a decision. What's the purpose? Will they make decisions? Be a liaison group? Make recommendations?
 - We will send out an email outlining the function of the subcommittee. We wanted to hear your input and create a collaborative process. It would also be nice to have the subcommittee attend different neighborhood meetings.
- The subcommittee could go round robin with the whole Task Force. We have been involved for a long time.
- Round robin of all Task Force members would be too much information to get up to speed. Would work better as a small group that reports back to the full Task Force.
- From my experience, subcommittee needs to be small and they usually don't make decisions. Typically they come back to the larger group with recommendations. I think 3-5 people would work really well.

- This (Land Use Subcommittee) is most critical piece. It needs to be hands-on. Let's get this done. I say 'yes' to subcommittee. I look forward to staff recommendations regarding the specifics of this group.
 - Staff will send the Task Force specifics to ensure there is a productive discussion regarding this topic at the next meeting.
- I agree that 3-5 is a good size. I think it is important to have a small group come back to the larger group and give an update.
- How do we formalize this? I would like to have more information.
 - The subcommittee would be formalized at a Task Force meeting.
- I would like to delay a decision on the subcommittee until I receive further information and detail.

Consensus Vote for Recommendation #3

12 – Unqualified Yes

The Task Force would like to extend their term. The Task Force generally agrees with the approach of forming a land use subcommittee. They would like to be provided with more information regarding the subcommittee.

6) Call to the Audience

One member of the public addressed the Task Force. She was interested if there was any feedback regarding the indirect left turn at Oracle Road and Grant Road.

7) Round Table

- Two comments: 1) Last August many of us were frustrated by the overlay delay. I am happy to see City staff. Phil - that you reacted like you have to our pleas. 2) The Indirect Left Turn questions – I teach brokers in real estate classes; they don't like the indirect left. They presume that there should be statistics comparing accidents prior to instituting the indirect left turn and post. Those stats would enable folks to look at the results. I would like to know if any research has been done. Kaneen can put that research out to the public if it is available.
- I am glad we have extended the Task Force term. I like being part of the process. The fact that the vision will be included (formal adoption) and overlay is back on track shows me that there is progress. I hope to revitalize west end.
- Happy
- The meeting was exciting, organized, presented well – liked the handout.
- I like the decision that the public will be informed (about the overlay). Last time, the public did not know even though this group thought that they did.

Grant Road IMPROVEMENT PLAN



- I use the Grant Road indirect left turn and it is much more convenient – I have not read a letter to the editor complimenting the indirect left turn.
- I am excited that things in the past have been brought to the forefront – feels like we are back on track.

8) Adjournment

7:30 p.m.